REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action mailed March 15, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, and 17 are hereby amended. Claim 12 was amended in part to incorporate the subject matter of claim 13. Claim 15 was amended in part to incorporate the subject matter of claims 16. Claims 14 and 17 were amended in part to depend from claims 13 and 15, respectively. No new matter has been added. Claims 13 and 16 are hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 14, 15, and 17 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office rejects claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. *Office Action* at ¶¶ 3-6 of page 2. Applicant has amended claim 7 to include the features of claim 6, and depend only on claim 5. Applicant has amended claim 9 by replacing the phrase "low-level functions" with --programmable code--, as suggested by the Office. In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 7 and 9.

The Office rejects claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. *Office Action* at ¶¶ 2-5 of pages 3-4. Claims 13 and 16 are cancelled herein, accordingly the rejection of those claims is moot. Applicant has amended claims 12, 14, 15, and 17 by adding the limitation of "non-transitory" to the claims as suggested by the Office. In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 12-17.

The Office rejects claims 1-9 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0163045 to Hui (hereinafter *Hui***).** *Office Action* at ¶ 7. Claims 13 and 16 are cancelled herein, accordingly the rejection of those claims is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims and requests reconsideration.

Hui fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently,

transmitting, from the server, at least a part of said set of associated parameters, and an instruction to <u>store said part of said set of associated parameters in a memory of the terminal</u>; and

transmitting, from the server, an instruction to <u>restore said part of said set of associated parameters previously stored in said memory of the terminal</u>, to edit at least one multimedia page in which an object identified by said set of associated parameters occurs

as recited in independent claim 1. *Hui* also fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently,

an instruction to <u>store, in a memory of a terminal,</u> at least one parameter of at least one object intended to be arranged, according to said parameter, in a multimedia page suitable for editing on said terminal, and

an instruction to <u>restore the at least one parameter previously stored in the memory of the terminal</u>

as recited in independent claim 12 and as similarly recited in independent claim 15.

In other words, independent claims 1, 12, and 15 each recite a step of storing parameters in a memory of a terminal (which can be for example a telephone), and a step of retrieving these parameters from the memory of the terminal. As will be understood, the same graphic objects can retain the same arrangement parameters from one multimedia page to a next multimedia page. Then, usually, transmission and storage of data relating to this object, for a number of pages in which that same object occurs with the same parameters, is normally necessary. See Specification at p. 1, lines 21-35. This problem becomes particularly acute when there is a need for a number of parameters to be transmitted from a server to a terminal (the bandwidth allocated for the communication is thus restricted). In *Hui*, if such parameters were stored, they would have been stored in the file storage 44 of figure 5. However, *Hui's* figure 5 shows the server, <u>but not</u> the terminal). *See also Hui* at ¶¶ 0049 and 0064-0065. Therefore, the subject matter of the present invention is patentably distinguishable over *Hui*, at least because the feature of storage of parameters in a memory of a terminal (separate from a server) and the retrieval of the parameters from the same memory cannot be found in *Hui*.

Moreover, *Hui* does not address the problem of several transmissions between a server and a terminal for retrieving, in the terminal, data related to a same object to display. However, the present invention provides such a solution. One skilled in the art would never find any incentive to use the teachings of *Hui*, when faced with the problems that lead to the invention as

claimed. Moreover, *Hui* fails to disclose any functions such as "SAVE" or "RESTORE" for organizing the memory of the terminal (organizing the memory of a server, which can contain more data, being useless). Therefore, the subject matter of the present application is not anticipated by *Hui*, which does not even deal with the same problems and solutions.

The Office rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hui* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/01040900 to Salmi (hereinafter *Salmi*). *Office Action* at ¶ 25. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

For at least all of the reasons presented above, *Hui* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1, from which claim 10 depends. *Salmi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Hui*. In fact, *Salmi* was cited only for an alleged teaching of "a mobile terminal capable of interaction with Cellular network." *Office Action* at ¶ 26, p. 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over *Hui* in view of *Salmi*, at least by virtue its dependency from claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 10.

CONCLUSION

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: ___June 15, 2010_____   By _____/Michael I. Angert/_____
                                              Michael I. Angert
                                              Registration No. 46,522
                                      McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
                                      1900 K Street, N.W.
                                      Washington, DC 20006
                                      (202) 496-7500
                                      Attorneys for Applicant